

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-36, 38-44, 46, 47, and 49-61 were pending in the application. The Office Action dated February 10, 2011 rejects all claims under a new ground of rejection. This paper amends claims 1, 18, 38, 46, and 58. Claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-36, 38-44, 46, 47, and 49-61 remain pending in the application after entry of this paper.

Independent claims 1, 18, 38, 46, and 58 are amended herein to more clearly recite Applicants' invention. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. The claims are amended in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-36, 38-44, 46, 47, and 49-61 as presented prior to this Amendment as well as additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

The Office Action rejects 46 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for reasons stated in the Office Action at page 2. Claim 46 is amended herein to depend on claim 44. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 46, and claim 47 dependent thereon.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9, 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taurisano (U.S. Patent No. 1,921,895). Claim 1 is amended herein. Applicants traverse the rejection to the extent that it is maintained against claims 1-9, 11, and 15 as now set forth because Taurisano does not teach or suggest every limitation as set forth in these claims.

Applicants' invention as recited in representative claim 1 relates generally to a pin valve assembly that includes a pin block housing a valve pin, a fluid plate

including a fluid channel, and a pin valve seat. The pin valve seat communicates with the fluid channel between a first portion of the fluid channel and a second portion of the fluid channel. The pin valve seat abuts both an opening at the first portion of the fluid channel and an opening at the second portion of the fluid channel. The opening at the second portion of the fluid channel is near to a same outer surface of the fluid plate as the opening at the first portion. When the valve pin is seated in the pin valve seat, both openings are blocked by the valve pin seated in the pin valve seat such that the flow of fluid in the fluid channel is substantially prevented from flowing between the first and second portions of the fluid channel.

Taurisano teaches a fuel mixing apparatus that includes a fuel supply valve 54 coupled to a gasoline tank 50 via a pipe 52 (see Taurisano, FIGs. 2, 3, and 7). The valve 54 includes a shell 56 and a member 60 positioned in a lower side of the shell 56. An opening 70 extends through a side of the member 60. A passageway 68 extends through the length of the member 60 between a seat 66 at an upper side of the passageway 68 and a chamber 72 at a bottom of the member 60. The passageway 74 in turn is between the chamber 72, another chamber 76, and a pipe 78 extending from the other chamber 76 to a valve 16 of a gasoline cylinder. A lower end of a needle valve 64 can be positioned in the seat 66 to control an amount of fuel being drawn from the gasoline tank 50 to the valve 16 of the gasoline cylinder. However, the seat 66 abuts a single opening, namely, the opening of the passageway 68. There is no teaching or suggestion in Taurisano of the seat 66 abutting two openings, namely, an opening at a first portion of a fluid channel and an opening at a second portion of a fluid channel, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, even if the needle valve 64 is positioned in the seat 66, only a single opening, i.e., the passageway 68, is blocked.

Further, the opening at the passageway 68 (referred to in the Office Action as a “first portion”) and the opening 70 in the passageway of the member 60 (referred to in the Office Action as a “second portion”) are along different surfaces of the fluid plate of Taurisano, not the same outer surface of the member 60 as required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Taurisano does not teach or suggest the limitations identified above in amended independent claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1.

Claims 2-9, 11, and 15 depend from independent claim 1, and are patentable for at least those reasons presented above in connection with independent claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of these claims also be withdrawn.

Claims 18, 22, 24, 26, 27, 32-34, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hammock (U.S. Patent No. 2,589,373). Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15, 19-21, 23, 35, 38-44, 46, 47, 49, 55, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammock alone. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Hammock does not teach or suggest all the limitations recited in these claims.

Hammock teaches an adjustable choke for oil wells. The choke includes a chamber 39 between a disk 14 and a head 15. A plurality of ports 41 extends through the disk 14, and a beveled seat 40 is positioned in each port 41. The ports 41 can be closed by corresponding seating members 37 that are positioned against the seats 40 to prevent well fluid from flowing through the ports 41.

The Office Action refers to the port 41 extending through the disk 14 in which the seat 40 is arranged as being a “first portion of a fluid channel,” and

refers to an interior space defined by the seat 40 as being a “second portion of the fluid channel.” Although Hammock teaches that a seating member 37 can be seated in the seat 40 to block fluid from flowing from the chamber 39 through the port 40, the opening of the port 41 and the opening at the interior space defined by the seat 40 are not proximal to a same outer surface of the disk 14.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Hammock does not teach or suggest the limitations identified above in amended independent claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1.

Independent claims 18, 38, and 58 as amended above recites claim language similar to that of independent claim 1 and therefore, are patentable for at least those reasons provided in connection with claim 1. Dependent claims 2-9, 11, 13, 15, 19-24, 26, 27, 32, 33-35, 46, 47, 49, 55, and 56 depend from independent claims 1, 18, and 38 respectively, and are patentable for at least those reasons presented above in connection with independent claims 1, 18, and 38. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection against these claims also be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammock in view of Cooper, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,713,333 – hereinafter “Cooper”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because claim 10 depends from allowable independent claim 1, and is patentable for at least that reason.

Claims 14, 16, 17, 36, 37, 57, and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammock in view of Hauck (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,487). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because claims 14, 16,

17, 36, 37, 57, and 59-61 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 18, 38, and 58, respectively, and are patentable for at least those reasons.

Claims 28-31 and 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammock in view of Wylie, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,045,343 – hereinafter “Wylie”), where Wylie is taken with Achener, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,045,343 – hereinafter “Achenner”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because claims 28-31 and 50-54 depend from allowable independent claims 18 and 38, respectively, and are patentable for at least those reasons.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed.

In view of the remarks made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Amendment and Response  
Attorney Docket No.: W-355-6-7-02  
Application No. 10/597,525  
Page 18

Date: May 6, 2011  
Reg. No. 58,037

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003  
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/Timothy P. Collins/  
Timothy P. Collins  
Attorney for Applicants  
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP  
5 Mount Royal Avenue  
Marlborough, MA 01752